

REMARKS

Claims 61-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61 and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Heinrich, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,167). Claims 53, 55, 58, 60, 63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinrich. Claims 51, 52, 54-57, 59-62, 64 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flyntz (“6,389,542) in view of Angelo (“U.S. Patent 5,949,882”). The Examiner’s rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office rejected claims 61-65 as non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Office rejected the claims as being directed to a signal. Claims 61-65 are directed to a computer readable medium, not a signal. The Interim Guidelines admit that “function descriptive material”—which is “...data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component”—is generally statutory when “recorded on a computer-readable medium”. The reason is that “...the use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized.” The rejections of claims 61-65 as non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are therefore erroneous. Each of claims 61-65 recites statutory subject matter. The recitation of the “computer readable medium” in the preamble limits the claims and therefore renders it statutory under applicable law and policy as embodied in the Interim Guidelines. Accordingly, Applicant requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Heinrich, Flyntz, and Angelo fail to teach or suggest the features of the claimed subject matter. The claimed subject matter includes, among other things, receiving a request for an authentication at a microcontroller included in a bridge over a bus external to the bridge from a

source remote from the computer system and approving the authentication at the microcontroller responsive to security data being evaluated as acceptable. Hence, applicants teach a security structure for evaluating requests received over a bus from remote sources. Heinrich is directed to providing security to a computer system for authenticating passwords provided by a user accessing the computer system using a keyboard. The authentication request is not received over an external bus and from a source remote from the computer system. Heinrich employs a dedicated interface for communicating with the keyboard. The interface is neither external to the bridge, nor is the authentication request received from a source remote from the computer system. A user interfacing with the computer system via the keyboard is not remote with respect to the computer system, but rather directly interfacing with the computer system. Heinrich is specifically directed to preventing passwords from being snooped via remote queries. Therefore Heinrich teaches away from authenticating remote requests. For these reasons, claims 51-65 are allowable over Heinrich. Applicants respectfully request the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Flyntz is also directed to controlling access to the computer system by a user directly interfacing with the system, not a remote authentication request. As admitted by the Examiner, Flyntz does not describe or suggest receiving a request for an authentication at a microcontroller included in a bridge, as set forth in the claimed subject matter. Angelo does not mention any such microcontroller included in the bridge or any type of security processing occurring in the bridge. Applicants do not attack the references individually, but rather, collectively. Taken as a whole, the combination of Flyntz and Angelo fails to teach or suggest receiving a request for an authentication at a microcontroller included in a bridge over a bus external to the bridge from a source remote from the computer system and approving the authentication at the microcontroller

responsive to security data being evaluated as acceptable. Flyntz is not directed to remote authentication requests and Angelo fails to correct this defect. For these reasons, claims 51-65 are allowable over Flyntz and Angelo. Applicants respectfully request the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2007

/Scott F. Diring/

Scott F. Diring
Reg. No. 35,119
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-4070
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS